

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Attached hereto is a complete listing of all claims in the application, with their current status listed parenthetically. By this Response, claims 1 and 6 have been amended, and are presented with markings to indicate their current amendments. Claims 2, 8 and 11-15 have been cancelled without prejudice to later prosecution.

1st Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintains his rejection of pending claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,603,818 ("Dress"). As discussed below, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A. The Law of Anticipation and Enabling Prior Art References

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id.*

However, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1 and 6 have elements that cannot be found, either expressly or inherently, in Dress.

For example, Applicant's amended claim 1 recites, in part:

"...at least one slot allocation unit coupled to said at least one frequency divider, the slot allocation unit capable of different repetition frequencies. . ."

And Applicant's amended claim 6 recites, in part:

"... at least one slot allocation unit communicating with the at least one frequency divider, the slot allocation unit capable of different repetition frequencies. . ."

Dress contains no teaching or suggestion of a slot allocation unit capable of different repetition frequencies. In fact, Dress teaches that "these pulses have uniform time spacing and

thus constitute a stable, single frequency" (col. 8, lines 59-61). Therefore, Dress fails to teach slot allocation units "capable of different repetition frequencies".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Dress cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 6 and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection. Claims 3-5, 7 and 9-10 depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, and accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3-5, 7 and 9-10 has been traversed by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 6.

2nd Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,300,903 ("Richards"). As discussed below, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As claims 11-15 have been cancelled without prejudice to later prosecution, the rejection is now moot.


Conclusion

Applicant believes that this Response has addressed all items in the Office Action and now places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10 at an early date is solicited. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the \$60.00 one-month extension of time fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-3143, in the name of Pulse-Link, Inc. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

October 17, 2005

Date



Peter R. Martinez
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,845

c/o PULSE-LINK, INC.
1969 Kellogg Avenue
Carlsbad, California 92008
Telephone No.: (760) 607-0844